

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA  
WESTERN DIVISION  
No. 5:11-CV-209-D

WANDA PATTERSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

MICHAEL J. ASTRUE,  
Commissioner of the Social Security  
Administration,

Defendant.

**ORDER**

On July 13, 2012, Magistrate Judge Gates issued a Memorandum and Recommendation (“M&R”) [D.E. 73]. In the M&R, Judge Gates recommended that the court grant plaintiff’s motion for judgment on the pleadings [D.E. 68], deny defendant’s motion for judgment on the pleadings [D.E. 70], and remand the case to the Commissioner pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. 405(g). Neither party filed objections to the M&R.

“The Federal Magistrates Act requires a district court to make a de novo determination of those portions of the [magistrate judge’s] report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (alteration in original) (emphasis and quotation omitted). Absent a timely objection, “a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Id. (quotation omitted).

The court has reviewed the M&R, the record, and the briefs. The court is satisfied that there is no clear error on the face of the record. Plaintiff’s motion for judgment on the pleadings [D.E. 68] is GRANTED, defendant’s motion for judgment on the pleadings [D.E. 70] is DENIED, and

this action is REMANDED to the Commissioner pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. 405(g).

The clerk shall close the case.

SO ORDERED. This 3 day of August 2012.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JAMES C. DEVER III  
Chief United States District Judge